1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7 8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9 10	LASER DESIGN INTERNATIONAL, LLC; NORWOOD OPERATING COMPANY, Plaintiffs,	Lead Case No. C 03-1179 JSW Consolidated with No. C 03-3905 JSW
11	V.	Consolidated with 140. C 03 3703 35 W
12 13 13 14 15 15 15 16 17 20 21 22 23 24	BJ CRYSTAL, INC, a California corporation; CASHMAN PHOTO ENTERPRISES OF NEVADA, a Nevada corporation; CRYSTAL MAGIC, INC., a Florida Corporation; U.C. LASER, INC., a New Jersey corporation; VITRO LASER GROUP U.S.A., INC., a Nevada corporation; JIMAC MARKETING INC., a Canadian corporation; CONCORD INDUSTRIES, INC., a Connecticut corporation; C. STIEFELMAYER GMBH & Co. KG, a German limited partnership; CERION GMBH, a German limited liability company; CRYSTAL CAPTURE INC., a Texas corporation; CRYSTAL CAPTURE INTERNATIONAL, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company; G.W. PARTNERS INTERNATIONAL, INC., a California corporation; VISIONS IN CRYSTAL, INC., a California corporation; VISIONS IN CRYSTAL, INC., a California corporation; VITRO LASER GMBH, a German limited liability company,	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
25	AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS	
26		
27	On February 9, 2006, Defendant and Co	unterclaimant Vitro Laser Group USA, Inc.
28	("Vitro Laser") filed a Notice of Automatic Stay	y. The Notice provides that on March 24, 2005

For the Northern District of California 8 4 2 4 4 8

Vitro Laser filed a petition under Chapter 11 of the United States Code of Bankruptcy in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas. Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362, the filing of the petition operates a stay as to all actions against Vitro Laser.

By no later than April 7, 2006, the parties in the above captioned matter shall file simultaneous briefs explaining what effect, if any, the stay as to Vitro Laser has on the case with respect to the other parties. In particular, the parties should address whether the case may proceed against the remaining defendants even if issues decided as to the claims raised against or by them may operate as issue preclusion with respect to the claims against or by Vitro Laser.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 23, 2006

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE